

## **Moving at scale: Promising practice and practical guidance on evaluation of physical activity programmes in the UK**

*Justin Varney<sup>1</sup>, Rachel Lawson<sup>2</sup>, Tim Williams<sup>2</sup>, Robert Copeland<sup>3</sup>, Mike Brannan<sup>1</sup>, Andy Lane<sup>4</sup>, Lynne Kennedy<sup>5</sup>, Chris Beedie<sup>6</sup>, Greg Whyte<sup>7</sup>, Alfonso Jimenez<sup>8</sup>, Gavin Sandercock<sup>9</sup>, Darcy Hare<sup>10</sup>, Matthew Wade<sup>2</sup>, Alex Lucas<sup>2</sup>, Lizzie Broughton<sup>2</sup>, Steven Mann<sup>11</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>Public Health England, <sup>2</sup>ukactive, <sup>3</sup>Sheffield Hallam University, <sup>4</sup>University of Wolverhampton, <sup>5</sup>University of Chester, <sup>6</sup>Canterbury Christ Church University, <sup>7</sup>Liverpool John Moores University, <sup>8</sup>Coventry University, <sup>9</sup>University of Essex, <sup>10</sup>Sport England, <sup>11</sup>Places for People Leisure*

**Purpose:** To develop effective physical activity (PA) frameworks policy makers require an understanding of which interventions increase PA at population level. This investigation identified PA interventions in the UK; considered key challenges in evaluating interventions; and provided guidance to inform and support effective evaluation. It followed from a 2014 investigation that identified and benchmarked PA interventions in England.

**Methods:** An open call for examples of good and promising practice was made to organisations, groups, and individuals delivering PA interventions in the UK. Participants completed a questionnaire based upon elements of the Standard Evaluation Framework for Physical Activity Programmes. Nesta Standards of Evidence were interpreted and used to score projects and programmes based on an assessment of the evaluation method used.

**Results:** A total of 302 completed submissions were assessed; 17 interventions used a control or comparison group; 12 were evaluated by an external evaluator; 55% of interventions collected pre/post measures; 22% engaged between 1,000 and 5,000 participants with 8% including >25,000 participants; 27% had been on-going for 2-5 years; 55% were delivered in a local authority leisure facility; 40% received funding from local authorities and 32% from private funders.

**Conclusions:** The quality of monitoring, data collection, and evaluation processes embedded into programme delivery has improved since the 2014 review, which is encouraging. Non-inclusion of control or comparison groups (although not always appropriate) remains a barrier in demonstrating the causal impact of programmes. Few studies reported independent evaluation. Inadequate or incomplete submissions also impacted assessment.